REMARKS

Claims 27, 28, 34, 35, 40 and 41 are pending. Claims 27, 34 and 40 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 27, 28, 34, 35, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Girerd et al. (U.S. 6,131,067) patent. With respect to applicant's claims, as amended, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, applicant's claim 40 has been amended to recite "A connection program stored on a computer readable medium for controlling a connection apparatus connecting with a remote site, comprising ..." Accordingly, claim 40 claims a connection program stored on a computer readable medium and since the computer readable medium is tangible, the claim is directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, claim 40, as well as dependent claim 41, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, and it requested that the rejection of claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 101 be withdrawn.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), independent claims 27, 34 and 40 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Independent claim 27 is directed to a connection apparatus for connecting with a remote site, comprising moving means for moving a part, input means for inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning the part, and transmission means for transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site. Independent claims 34 and 40 relate to a related method and connection program, respectively.

Applicant's claim 27, as amended, specifically calls for, among other things, moving means for moving a part and input means for inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning the part to be moved. Independent claims 34 and 40 recite corresponding features. As discussed from page 24, line 24 to page 31, line 3 of the present application, as originally filed, an exemplary semiconductor aligner, such as shown in Figure 8 of the drawings, includes a wafer z (stage 3308) having an ID stored thereon (page 26, line 24 to page 27, line 5). The optical reader of the aligner generates an ID by reading the reference information from the wafer (page 27, line 6 to page 28, line 6) and the generated ID is supplied to a CPU which causes, via a communication interface and device, the ID to be transmitted to a remote site to assess whether the ID is legal (i.e., the ID is included on a list of acceptable IDs) (page 28, line 7 to page 29, line 20). If the ID is not accepted, then the semiconductor aligner's operation of aligning the wafer is terminated (page 29, line 21 to page 30, line 8).

In the office action, the Examiner relies upon the Girerd et al. patent and alleges that it discloses "input inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning a part; transmitting to the remote site data and a GPS signal in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site (see column 2 lines 36-53)." While the Girerd et al. patent discloses use of a GPS system and an output of a remote sensor 20 (snapshot GPS receiver 220, time trigger 224, cell phone with modem 222) is used as an input to the GPS system, the remote sensor 20 provides or detects information for determining the location or position of the sensor (see column 2, lines 15-58; column 5, lines 26-67; column 6, lines 23-33), and not information for positioning a part to be moved.

The patent further mentions that the determined location information can then be used for alerting an emergency operator, for stolen vehicle tracking, for inventory control, for parental supervision of minors, for monitoring probationers or for "other situations where accurate reporting of location of a remote object are required." (see column 6, line 49 through column 7, line 5). None of these applications, however, involve or are a teaching for positioning a part to be moved.

Accordingly, applicant's amended independent claims 27, 34 and 40, and their respective independent claims, in reciting "moving a part, . . . [and] inputting an output from a device used for detecting information for positioning the part, and transmission means for transmitting to the remote site data in accordance with the output, wherein the data is used as identification in connection with the remote site," patentably distinguish over Girerd et al. patent.

In view of the foregoing, applicant's independent claims 27, 34 and 40, as well as claims 28, 35 and 41 dependent thereon, are not anticipated by the Girerd et al. patent. It is therefore requested that the rejection of claims 27, 28, 34, 35, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes an interview would expedite consideration of this Amendment or of the application, a request is made that the Examiner telephone applicant's counsel at (212) 790-9200.

Respectfully submitted,

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T (212) 790-9200

Mark Montague
Reg. No. 36,612